





UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Vignia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/111,911	07/08/1998	WILLIAM S. M. WOLD	16153-5587	6287
21888 7	590 09/04/2003			
THOMPSON COBURN, LLP			EXAMINER	
ONE US BANI SUITE 3500			SHUKLA, RAM R	
ST LOUIS, MO	) 63101		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1632	24
			DATE MAILED: 09/04/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

** <sub>*</sub>	•			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	09/111,911	WOLD, WILLIAM S. M.		
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Ram R. Shukla	1632		
The MAILING DATE of this communication				
THE REPLY FILED 04 October 2002 FAILS TO PLATHER TOPICATION Therefore, further action by the applicant is required final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Application (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114	to avoid abandonment of this er: (1) a timely filed amendme opeal (with appeal fee); or (3)	s application. A proper reply to a ent which places the application in		
PERIOD FO	R REPLY [check either a) or	b)]		
a) $\boxtimes$ The period for reply expires $\underline{4}$ months from the mailin	•		,	
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expired to the control of the control	xpire later than SIX MONTHS from WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONT	the mailing date of the final rejection.  HS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MP	PEP	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a), fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the pefee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See	eriod of extension and the correspor ate of the shortened statutory period e Office later than three months afte	ding amount of the fee. The appropriate e for reply originally set in the final Office ac	extension ction; or	
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appell 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37		•		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered	ed because:			
(a) ⊠ they raise new issues that would require f	further consideration and/or s	earch (see NOTE below):		
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see N		,		
(c) X they are not deemed to place the applicat	,	by materially reducing or simplifyin	g the	
issues for appeal; and/or	neeling a parroonending num	har of finally rejected alaims		
(d) they present additional claims without ca	riceling a corresponding num	bei of ilitally rejected claims.		
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .	pication(a):			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following re	ejection(s)			
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) w canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	ould be allowable if submitte	d in a separate, timely filed amend	lment	
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request application in condition for allowance because		en considered but does NOT place	the	
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	because it is not directed SC	DLELY to issues which were newly	1	
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amenda explanation of how the new or amended claim				
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	ows:			
Claim(s) allowed: <u>1,4 and 23-25</u> .				
Claim(s) objected to: 26.				
Claim(s) rejected: 7,10 and 13.				
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:				
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on	_ is a)□ approved or b)□	disapproved by the Examiner.		

9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_

10. Other: \_\_\_\_\_ RAM R. SHUKLA, PH.D. PRIMARY EXAMINER

Ram R. Shukla, Ph.D. Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1632

10. Other: \_\_\_\_

À1.





Continuation of 2. NOTE: Applicants have proposed to cancel claims 7, 10 and 13 and amend claim 26 by incorporating the limitations of claims 7, 10 and 13 in claim 26. However, as noted in the office action of 10-15-01, 1-2-02, 6-17-02 and 9-13-02, claimed invention is only enabled for an in vitro method of inhibiting apoptosis and not enabled for transplantation or therapy and since claim 26 as proposedly amended is directed to decreasing rejection of transplanted cells, it is not enabled for reasons of record. Additionally, applicants did not provide any explanation as to how the amendment reduced issues or addressed the rejection. Therefore, amendments to claim 26 do not reduce the issues for appeal because they do not address the grounds of enablement rejection set forth in the previous office actions. Applicants did not indicate what was the status of the new claims 27 and 28 proposed in the response of 8-21-02. Additionally, since applicants did not indicate what was to be done with the response filed 8-21-02, it is not clear what are the limitations of claim 26 as pending in view of the proposed amendments of 8-21-02 and 10-4-02. Therefore, amendments do not reduce the issues for appeal.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants' did not provide any new arguments with the proposed amendments as to how the proposed amendment to claim 26 addressed the enablement rejection set forth in the previous office actions of 10-15-01, 1-2-02, 6-17-02 and 9-13-02.

RAM R. SHUK! A., PH.D. PRIMARY EXAM! 13

BEST AVAILABLE COPY